



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/616,677	07/08/2003	Glen A. Oross	200308977-1	2586

22879 7590 11/16/2005

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

BLACKMAN, ROCHELLE ANN J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2851

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/616,677

Applicant(s)

OROSS, GLEN A.

Examiner

Rochelle Blackman

Art Unit

2851

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 August 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4,6,7,9-16,19-21 and 25-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 9 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4,6,7,10-16,19-21 and 25-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07/08/03 & 08/03/04 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 9-16, 19-21, and 25-31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1, 16, 20, 26, 27, 30, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Peng et al. (TW Patent No. 500968 - U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0151922 is being used as a translation).

Regarding claim 1, Peng discloses a digital projector (see 100 of Figs. 1-5) configured to mount to a ceiling (see pg. 1, paragraphs [0002]-[0004], [0018] – “digital projector” 100 is considered to be mounted to or can be mounted to a ceiling because it installed over the ceiling, in addition, “digital projector” 100 is also capable of being mounted to the ceiling because it has a flat surface), comprising: a projector housing (see 110 of Figs. 1-5); and a manually openable panel (see 230 of Figs. 1-5) that provides access to the interior of the projector housing; where the panel remains connected to the projector housing while open (see 230 in Fig. 5), wherein the digital

Art Unit: 2851

projector is configured so that the panel is accessible when the digital projector is mounted to the ceiling (see location of 230 in Fig. 5).

Regarding claim 16, Peng discloses a method of making a digital projector (see function of elements in Figs. 1-5), comprising: providing a projector housing (see function of 100 in Figs. 1-5); providing a projector access panel (see function of 230 in Figs. 1-5); connecting the access panel to the projector housing, so that the access panel remains associated with the projector housing while open (see function of 230 and 290 in Fig. 5); configuring the access panel to be manually openable (see function of 230 and 290 in Fig. 5); and configuring the access panel to be accessible when the digital projector is mounted to a ceiling (see pg. 1, paragraphs [0002]-[0004], [0018] – “digital projector” 100 is considered to be mounted to or can be mounted to a ceiling because it installed over the ceiling, in addition, “digital projector” 100 is also capable of being mounted to the ceiling because it has a flat surface).

Regarding claim 20, Peng discloses a method of changing a lamp (see 300 in Fig. 2) in a digital projector (see function of elements in Figs. 1-5), where the digital projector includes a manually openable panel (see 230 in Figs. 1-5) that provides access to the lamp, and that remains associated with the projector while open (see function of 290 in Fig. 5), and where the digital projector is mounted to a ceiling (see pg. 1, paragraphs [0002]-[0004], [0018] – “digital projector” 100 is considered to be mounted to or can be mounted to a ceiling because it installed over the ceiling, in addition, “digital projector” 100 is also capable of being mounted to the ceiling because it has a flat surface), the method comprising: manually opening the panel (see function

Art Unit: 2851

of 230 in Figs. 1-5); removing a lamp module (see 210 in Figs. 1-5) from the projector (see locations of "lamp module" 210 relative to "projector" 100 in Figs. 1-5); removing the lamp from the lamp module (see paragraph [0020]); inserting a replacement lamp in the lamp module (also see [0020]); and inserting the lamp module in the projector"(also see locations of "lamp module" 210 relative to "projector" 100 in Figs. 1-5).

Regarding claims 26, Peng discloses a digital projector (100), comprising: means for projecting an image (130), means for housing the projecting means (110); and means for providing access to the interior of the housing means (230), where the means for providing access is manually operable and remains connected to the housing means (see 230 and 290 in Fig. 5), and is accessible when the digital projector is mounted to a ceiling (see location of 230 and see pg. 1, paragraphs [0002]-[0004], [0018] – "digital projector" 100 is considered to be mounted to or can be mounted to a ceiling because it installed over the ceiling, in addition, "digital projector" 100 is also capable of being mounted to the ceiling because it has a flat surface).

Regarding claim 27, Peng discloses a means for disabling the projecting means when the means for providing access is operated ("projector" 100 is considered to have an on/off switch or button which is considered to be a "disabling means" for "disabling the projector means").

Regarding claim 30, Peng discloses where the means for providing access to the interior of the housing is configured to permit removal of one or more components (see 210 and 300 in Figs. 1-5) of the projecting means (see function of 230 in Fig. 5).

Regarding claim 31, Peng discloses where the means for providing access to the interior of the housing is configured to permit replacement of one or more components (see 300 in Figs. 2) of the projecting means (see function of 230 and paragraph [0020]).

Note: the following 102(b) rejection is provided below in the event a 1.131 affidavit of prior invention is submitted against Peng et al. (TW Patent No. 500968) used in the rejection above.

2. Claims 1, 4, 13-16, 19, 26, 27, 28, 30, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rodriguez, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,802,864).

Regarding claim 1, Rodriguez, Jr. discloses a digital projector (see 10 of Figs. 1, 2, and 4) configured to mount to a ceiling (contrary to the rejections made with the Rodriguez, Jr. reference in the Office action dated April 21, 2004 and Applicants remarks in response to those rejections, the Rodriguez, Jr. reference, "digital projector" 100 is considered to be capable of being mounted to the ceiling because it has a flat surface, the "digital projector" can be suspended from the ceiling and supported by way of the bottom surface, which is a flat surface – note: contrary to Applicant's assertion, the limitation "configured to mount to a ceiling" does require the "digital projector" to be mounted to a ceiling and therefore does not further limit the apparatus, the "digital projector"), comprising: a projector housing (see 12 of Figs. 1, 2, and 4); and a manually openable panel (see 50, 62 of Figs. 3, 5, 6, 6a, and 7) that provides access to the interior of the projector housing; where the panel remains connected to the projector

housing while open (see 54 of Fig. 7), wherein the digital projector is configured so that the panel is accessible when the digital projector is mounted to the ceiling ("digital projector" 10 is considered to be capable of being arranged so that the panel is accessible when it is mounted to the ceiling).

Regarding claim 4, Rodriguez, Jr. discloses where the panel is openable by depressing a latch actuator (see where the smaller arrow is pointing in Fig. 5 or see 23 of Figs. 6, 6a, 8, and 9).

Regarding claim 13, Rodriguez, Jr. discloses a safety interlock (see 80 of Figs. 8 and 9 and col. 5, lines 16-22) configured to interact with the panel.

Regarding claim 14, Rodriguez, Jr. discloses where the safety interlock is configured to disable at least one projector component when the panel is open (also see 80 of Figs. 8 and 9 and col. 5, lines 16-22).

Regarding claim 15, Rodriguez, Jr. discloses where the safety interlock is configured to prevent the panel from opening while a hazardous condition exists within the projector housing (also see 80 of Figs. 8 and 9 and col. 5, lines 16-22).

Regarding claims 16 and 19, the "method of making a digital projector" is similarly met by the features and functions of the above-mentioned elements for the "digital projector" of claims 1 and 4.

Regarding claims 26-28, the "digital projector" is similarly met by the above-mentioned elements for the "digital projector" of claims 1, 4 and 13-15. Regarding claim 26, Rodriguez, Jr. also discloses means for projecting an image (see 42 of Fig. 1).

Regarding claims 30, Rodriguez, Jr. discloses where the means for providing access to the interior of the housing is configured to permit removal of one or more components of the projecting means (see col. 5, lines 13-16 and 35-43).

Regarding claim 31, Rodriguez, Jr. discloses where the means for providing access to the interior of the housing is configured to permit replacement of one or more components of the projecting means (also see col. 5, lines 13-16 and 35-43).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 4, 13-15, 19, 21, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peng et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0151922) in view of Rodriguez, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,082,864).

Peng discloses the claimed invention except for the panel being openable by depressing a "latch actuator"; a "safety interlock" configured to interact with the panel; "where the safety interlock is configured to disable at least one projector component when the panel is open"; "where the safety interlock is configured to prevent the panel from opening while a hazardous condition exists within the projector housing"; configuring the access panel to be manually openable includes providing a "latch closure" for the access panel; opening the panel includes depressing a "latch actuator";

and "means for disabling the means for providing access while a hazardous condition exists within the housing means".

Rodriguez teaches providing a latch actuator/closure (see where the smaller arrow is pointing in Fig. 5 or see 23 of Figs. 6, 6a, 8, and 9) and a safety interlock/means for disabling the means for providing access (see 80 of Figs. 8 and 9 and col. 5, lines 16-22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to provide the "digital projector" of the Peng reference with a "latch actuator" or "latch closure" and a "safety interlock" or "means for disabling the means for providing access", as taught by Rodriguez in order to help align the "panel" correctly and secure the "panel" in a closed position and protect a user from electric shock.

2. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,726,336) in view of Peng et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0151922).

Matsuda discloses the claimed invention except for the digital projector being configured so that the projector component is only "removable" when the panel is open.

Peng teaches providing a projector component (see 210 of Figs. 1-5) that is only removable when a panel (see 230 of Fig. 5) is open.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to configure the "digital projector" of the Matsuda reference so that the "projector component" is only "removable" when the "panel" is open in the Matsuda

Art Unit: 2851

reference, as taught by Peng in order to protect the "projector component" from damage or from being inadvertently removed by other means.

3. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,726,336) in view of Rodriguez, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,082,864).

Matsuda discloses the claimed invention except for the digital projector being configured so that the projector component is only "removable" when the panel is open.

Rodriguez teaches providing a projector component (see 70 of Figs. 6 and 7) that is only removable when a panel (see 50, 62 of Figs. 6 and 7) is open.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to configure the "digital projector" of the Matsuda reference so that the "projector component" is only "removable" when the "panel" is open in the Matsuda reference, as taught by Rodriguez, Jr. in order to protect the "projector component" from damage or from being inadvertently removed by other means.

4. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,726,336) in view of Peng et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0151922).

Matsuda discloses the claimed invention except for the panel additionally providing access to a projector component that includes a "lamp module".

Peng teaches providing access to a projector component that includes a lamp module (see 210, 300 of Figs. 1-5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made for the "panel" of the "digital projector" of the Matsuda reference to also provide access to a projector component that includes a "lamp module", as taught by Peng in order to allow the user to readily change or replace the lamp of the "digital projector" when the lamp is damaged or has completed its service life, thus enabling successful operation of the "digital projector".

5. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,726,336) in view Rodriguez, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,082,864).

Matsuda discloses the claimed invention except for the panel additionally providing access to a projector component that includes a "lamp module".

Rodriguez, Jr. teaches providing access to a projector component that includes a lamp module (see 70 of Figs. 6 and 7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made for the "panel" of the "digital projector" of the Matsuda reference to also provide access to a projector component that includes a "lamp module", as taught Rodriguez, Jr., in order to allow the user to readily change or replace the lamp of the "digital projector" when the lamp is damaged or has completed its service life, thus enabling successful operation of the "digital projector".

6. Claims 10-12 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peng et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0151922) in view of Kondo (U.S. Patent No. 6,250,004).

Peng discloses the claimed invention except for "where the panel provides access to service information when open" or "means for providing access to projector service information"; "where the service information includes an identification of a projector service provider"; and "where the panel provides access to a business card display device".

Kondo teaches that is known to provide a panel (10 of Fig. 1) that provides access to service information or a means for providing access to service information (11, 15 of Figs. 1-4) when open; where the service information includes an identification of a service provider (see 15 of Figs. 3 and 4); and where the business panel provides access to a business card display device (11 of Figs. 1-4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the digital projector of the Peng reference with a panel that provides projector service information/ means for providing access to projector service information and/or that includes identification of a projector service provider and/or provides access to a business card display device, as taught by Kondo for purpose of providing contacts for supplies, repairs and so forth (see col. 1, lines 21-27).

7. Claims 10-12 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodriguez, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,802,864) in view of Kondo (U.S. Patent No. 6,250,004).

Rodriguez, Jr. discloses the claimed invention except for "where the panel provides access to service information when open" or "means for providing access to projector service information"; "where the service information includes an identification

of a projector service provider"; and "where the panel provides access to a business card display device".

Kondo teaches that is known to provide a panel (10 of Fig. 1) that provides access to service information or a means for providing access to service information (11, 15 of Figs. 1-4) when open; where the service information includes an identification of a service provider (see 15 of Figs. 3 and 4); and where the business panel provides access to a business card display device (11 of Figs. 1-4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the digital projector of the Rodriguez, Jr. reference with a panel that provides projector service information/ means for providing access to projector service information and/or that includes identification of a projector service provider and/or provides access to a business card display device, as taught by Kondo for purpose of providing contacts for supplies, repairs and so forth (see col. 1, lines 21-27).

8. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,726,336) in view of Peng et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0151922).

Matsuda discloses the claimed invention except for upgrading the component includes "removing the component and inserting a replacement component".

Peng teaches removing a component (see 210, 300 of Figs. 105) and inserting a replacement component (see 210, 300 and paragraph [0020]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to "remove" a "component" and "insert" a "replacement component" in the "digital projector" of the Matsuda reference, as taught by Peng in order to replace "components" that are damaged or have completed its service life, thus enabling successful operation of the "digital projector".

9. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,726,336) in view of Rodriguez, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,802,864).

Matsuda discloses the claimed invention except for upgrading the component includes "removing the component and inserting a replacement component".

Rodriguez, Jr. teaches removing a component (see 70 of Figs. 6 and 7) and inserting a replacement component (see 70 of Figs. 6 and 7 and see col. 5, lines 13-16 and 35-43).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to "remove" a "component" and "insert" a "replacement component" in the "digital projector" of the Matsuda reference, as taught by Peng in order to replace "components" that are damaged or have completed its service life, thus enabling successful operation of the "digital projector".

Allowable Subject Matter

1. Claim 9 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

2. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Claim 9 has been found to be allowable because the prior art of record either alone or in combination, neither discloses nor makes obvious the digital projector comprising the particular feature of the control panel being accessible when the panel is closed, in combination with other particular combination of features recited in claim 9.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Umberg (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0234335), Equipment Security Apparatus

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rochelle Blackman whose telephone number is (571) 272-2113. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:30.

Art Unit: 2851

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Judy Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-2258. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



RB

William Perkey
Primary Examiner